



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,729	01/26/2001	Jeff (Yefim) Zhuk	8540/1(a)	6019

7590 03/25/2005

Thomas S. Birnev, Esq.
Dorr, Carson, Sloan & Birney, P.C.
3010 E. 6th Avenue
Denver, CO 80206

EXAMINER

DALENCOURT, YVES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/770,729

Applicant(s)

ZHUK, JEFF (YEFIM)

Examiner

Yves Dalencourt

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 10/15/2004.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding Applicant argument (page 2, last paragraph), the examiner maintains that Grasso does suggest the idea of user evaluations or usage value summaries associated with system elements (see col. 11, lines 11 – 40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grasso et al (US 5,892,909; hereinafter Grasso) in view of Helland et al (US 6,014,666; hereinafter Helland).

Regarding claims 1, 11, 17, and 21, Grasso teaches a system that allows multiple users to manage the distribution and delivery of information across an enterprise Intranet, the Internet, and common communication channels (see fig. 1C; col. 2, lines 20 - 33; claimed a distributed knowledge and process base providing multiple-user access

via a plurality of client devices to data, processes, and services), an intranet-based system with methods for co-active information delivery, using user role policies (col. 4, lines 29 – 30; suggesting a distributed object technology system (DOTS)), said system provides a wizard-like user interface which intuitively walks users through various tasks, including distribution of new documents, updating of existing documents, modifying profiles/policies of documents, groups, roles, and individuals (col. 15, lines 18 - 45; claimed said base providing a multi-level privilege-based access to a plurality of users via client devices); an adaptive distribution support causes subscriber lists to automatically respond to changes in group composition (col. 4, lines 39 – 47; claimed as an organization changes, newly eligible recipients are electronically contacted with their new profile (col. 4, lines 47 – 53; claimed said system methods also enabling creation and modification of user roles defining default settings limiting access and available functions for the role, assignment of roles to users and groups of users); and updating settings for users (col. 4, lines 53 – 55; claimed selected overriding of the default settings for individual users and groups of users).

Grasso teaches substantially all the limitations, but fails to specifically teach that each of the DOTS having a plurality of system elements including processes, data, and services to users, and system methods associated with all system elements enabling addition of new system elements and modification of the functionality and content of existing system elements.

However, Helland teaches, in an analogous art, a declarative and programmatic access control of component-based server applications using roles, which comprises a

plurality of DOTS having a plurality of system elements including processes, data, and services to users (fig. 19; col. 5, lines 14 - 30), and system methods associated with all system elements enabling addition of new system elements and modification of the functionality and content of existing system elements (col. 11, lines 11 – 34; col. 11, line 53 through col. 12, line 13; col. 16, lines 15 - 30).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grasso's device by incorporating a plurality of DOTS having a plurality of system elements including processes, data, and services to users, and system methods associated with all system elements enabling addition of new system elements and modification of the functionality and content of existing system elements as evidenced by Helland for the purpose of allowing developer(s) flexible declarative access control at various levels of processing services of the server application.

Regarding claims 2 – 5, Grasso and Helland teach all the limitations, and Grasso further teaches distribution related security level policies reflecting usage, as well summaries, bookmarks, and flags, access controllers and request (see col. 9, lines 17 – 21; col. 15, lines 18 – 25; col. 22, lines 46 - 53).

Regarding claims 6 - 10, Grasso and Helland teach all the limitations, and Helland further teaches the system methods that enable creation and modification of security types for system elements; assignment of default access levels and functions available for a role accessing a system element with a specific security type; and modification of system element usage properties based on user evaluation and usage

Art Unit: 2157

of the system element; wherein each DOTS further comprises a core defining a unified set of system operations applicable to all system elements; wherein the services provided by the system elements are selected from the group consisting of an email service, an address book service, a calendar service, a linked knowledge service, a database, a file management service, a conference service, a task manager service, and a match-maker service; wherein each DOTS further comprises a thematic search controller to search for system elements with selected parameters; and wherein the thematic search controller searches system elements across a plurality of DOTS (see col. 14, lines 3 – 59; and col. 14, line 60 through col. 15, line 20). The same motivation used for claims 1, 17, and 21 is valid for claims 6 – 10.

Regarding claims 12 - 13, Grasso and Helland teach all the limitations, and Grasso further teaches that at least one of the DOTS can be accessed by a user using a browser as the client device; and wherein each DOTS further comprises a repeated actions scheduler enabling users to schedule periodic system operations (col. 12, line 35 through col. 13, line 35).

Regarding claims 14 - 16, Grasso and Helland teach all the limitations, and Helland further teaches that at least one of the DOTS further comprises an action object defined by an executing environment descriptor and an action statement executable in this environment; wherein at least one of the DOTS further comprises a remote control scenario defined by a set of remote action objects and a sequence of conditional operations executed on the remote action objects; and wherein at least one of the DOTS further comprises a notification block to notify users about selected events. (col.

Art Unit: 2157

16, line 15 - 50). The same motivation used for claims 1, 17, and 21 is valid for claims 14 - 16.

Claims 18 - 20 and 22 - 23 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 8, 11, and 12, and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yves Dalencourt whose telephone number is (703) 308-8547. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30AM - 6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yves Dalencourt


March 20, 2005